DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 550 JC 680 302

MISSISSIPPI HIGHER EDUCATION CONFERENCE ON JUNIOR SENIOR COLLEGE CORE CURRICULUM COMPACT AND RE-PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS, ANNUAL JUNIOR COLLEGE WORKSHOP (2ND, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI, JUNE 28-29, 1966). PROCEEDINGS.

University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg.

Pub Date Jun 66

Note-83p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.40

Descriptors-BUSINESS EDUCATION, *CONFERENCE REPORTS, *JUNIOR COLLEGES, LIBERAL ARTS, PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION, PROFESSIONAL OCCUPATIONS, TEACHER EDUCATION, TECHNICAL EDUCATION, *TRANSFER POLICY, *TRANSFER PROGRAMS, TRANSFER STUDENTS, *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, WORKSHOPS

Identifiers-*Mississippi

The following were the main problems discussed at a junior college workshop in Mississippi: (1) the formation of a framework within which junior and senior colleges might develop core curricular or general education requirements acceptable for transfer between the institutions, and (2) the role of the junior colleges with respect to course offerings in the professional and pre-professional areas. Major addresses were given on such topics as the vocational and technical programs in the public junior colleges of the state, the role and scope of eight Mississippi institutions, uniform course numbering, pre-professional requirements for business administration, pre-professional requirements for teacher education, and pre-professional requirements in arts and sciences. (DG)

MISSISSIPPI HIGHER EDUCATION CONFERENCE
ON
JUNIOR SENIOR COLLEGE CORE CURRICULUM COMPACT
AND PRE-PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS

SECOND ANNUAL JUNIOR COLLEGE WORKSHOP

June 28 and 29, 1966

PROCEEDINGS

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND PSYCHOLOGY
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

JC680302
ED021550

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

MISSISSIPPI HIGHER EDUCATION CONFERENCE ON JUNIOR SENIOR COLLEGE CORE CURRICULUM COMPACT AND PRE-PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS

SECOND ANNUAL JUNIOR COLLEGE WORKSHOP

June 28 and 29, 1966

PROCEEDINGS

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND PSYCHOLOGY
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 24 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC680302

PREFACE

The impetus for the second Junior-Senior College Workshop was provided by Dr. Jobe as President of the Mississippi Association of Colleges through appointment of a committee to plan a program to follow through on the recommendations of the previous workshop. The committee determined that the workshop should concentrate its efforts in two directions. First, the workshop would strive to reach agreement with the junior and senior colleges relative to a type of compact pertaining to mutually acceptable common core learnings at the freshman and sophomore levels. Second, the workshop would devote attention to problems in the pre-professional preparation programs for majors in a number of academic areas. In addition, the Committee on Uniform Numbering held its first meeting while its members were in attendance at the workshop.

In keeping with the policy adopted for the first workshop, no effort was made to secure a binding commitment from the representatives of the various institutions. Rather, it was the purpose of the workshop to secure a full and frank discussion of problems mutual to the junior and senior colleges. Agreement was reached as to the general design of the compact regarding the common core for the

design of the compact regarding the common core for the freshman and sophomore levels, and it was urged that each institution study these recommendations. Endorsement for the implementation of these recommendations was subsequently given at the meeting of the Junior-Senior College Conference in Biloxi in October.

We were indeed grateful for the splendid representation from the institutions of higher learning at the workshop, and we consider it a privilege to have served as the host for this group. We especially wish to express our appreciation to those individuals who presented position papers, who served on the various committees, and who exercised leadership roles for the workshop sessions.

Carl L. McQuagge, Dean
School of Education and Psychology

INTRODUCTION

This publication contains the position papers that were persented, reports from the committees, and recommendations regarding the compact pertaining to common core requirements. The order of the material contained in the publication follows the same order as the program for the workshop and a copy of this program is to be found following the list of participants. Unfortunately, the publication cannot reproduce the lively discussinn of the problems and issues that followed each major presentation. It is our hope that this publication will serve to stimulate a remembrance of the discussions that took place and will thereby serve as a guide to further discussion of the problems and issues by the faculties of the institutions represented at the workshop.

We are most appreciative of the hard work that was done by the planning committee for this workshop. The members of this committee who met with Dr. Jobe in Jackson to plan the workshop were:

President F. B. Branch
Mr. Paul Hardin
President J. J. Hayden
Mr. B. L. Hill
Dr. E. R. Jobe
Dr. A. E. Knight
Dr. Aubrey Lucas
Dr. Carl McQuagge
Dr. James Mailey
President Robert Mayo

The University of Southern Mississippi is indeed pleased to have served as the host for the workshop, and we trust that the workshop has made a contribution to the continuing efforts to improve higher education within the state.

James H. Mailey, Chairman
Department of Educational
Administration

PARTICIPANTS

Board of Trustees: Institutions of Higher Learning

James T. Sparkman

Belhaven College

Billy B. Tames

Clarke Memorial College

J. Clifford Watson

Copiah-Lincoln Junior College

B. Frank Hunter
James M. Lewis

Delta State College

Mack G. McRaney
Pete Walker

East Central Junior College

Denver Brackier
Frank Rives
B. J. Tucker

East Mississippi Junior College

Ike Ethridge

Gulf Coast Junior College District

Curtis L. Davis
Ralph E. Dougherty
J. J. Hayden
William P. Lipscomb
Billie J. Lofton
C. G. Odom
Harold Wesson

Hinds Junior College

Floyd S. Elkins

Holmes Junior College

Glynn Martin
E. W. Wilson

Itawamba Junior College

James A. Thrash
R. L. Woods

Jones County Junior College

Ralph Brend
B. F. Ogletree
Terrell Tisdale
J. B. Young

Meridian Junior College

George R. Bahr
William F. Scaggs
Jack Shanks

Millsaps College

John H. Christmas

Mississippi College

R. A. McLemore
Clarice Mooney
Howard E. Spell

Mississippi Delta Junior College

Herman Thigpin

Mississippi State College for Women

S. A. Brasfield
Roy L. Cox
A. E. Knight

Mississippi State University

W. W. Littlejohn
Norman Merwine
Percy Neal
A. P. Posey
Francis Rhodes
J. E. Thomas

Northeast Junior College

Harmon W. Boggs
Harold T. White

Northwest Junior College

Jack Butts
James P. McCormick

Pearl River Junior College

Garvin H. Johnston
Enock Seal, Jr.
Marvin White

Southwest Mississippi Junior College

Charles R. Breeland
Horace C. Holmes
H. T. Huddleston

State Department of Education

Russell Crider
E. P. Sylvester
Ruth Wallace

University of Mississippi

Noel A. Childress
Robert B. Ellis
Charles W. Hartman
Randolph G. Kinabrew
Kenneth P. McLaughlin
S. A. Moorhead
Harry Smith

University of Southern Mississippi

John H. Allen
Claude Fike
Bertha Fritzsche
Jewel Golden
William Gower
Joseph A. Greene, Jr.
H. O. Jackson
Gilbert Langdon
Aubrey K. Lucas
James H. Mailey
Raymond Mannoni
W. D. McCain
Carl L. McQuagge
Comer Pound
Al Sturgeon
Sidney Weatherford
Merton Zahart

William Carey College

Sarah Gray
J. Ralph Noonkester

Wood Junior College

Donald R. Rushing

JUNIOR-SENIOR COLLEGE WORKSHOP
June 28 and 29, 1966

Tuesday

8:30 - 9:00 a.m.	Registration
	Presiding: Dr. John H. Allen
9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	Welcome. Dr. W. D. McCain
	Review of problems identified in previous workshop and development of basic concepts concerning the compact concept. Dr. Carl L. McQuagge.
10:30 - 12:00	Junior and Senior College groups meet separately to discuss concepts about and to make recommendations relative to the common core requirements.
	Junior College Group meets in Room 103. Dr. Floyd S. Elkins, Chairman.
	Senior College Group meets in Commons Room B. Dr. Calude E. Fike, Chairman.
	Committee on the Uniform Numbering System begins meeting in Room 114. Mr. Robert B. Ellis, Chairman.

Presiding: Dr. S. A. Brassfield

1:00 - 2:00 p.m.	Reports on Common Core Recommendations from the Junior College Group and from the Senior College Group. Organization of a sub-committee to harmonize the recommendations. Sub-committee meets in Room 127. Dr. J. J. Hayden, Chairman.

Presiding: Mr. Garvin H. Johnston

2:30 - 3:00 p.m.	Position paper regarding Vocational-Technical Programs. Mr. E. P. Sylvester.

3:00 - 3:30 p.m. Discussion and recommendations.

Presiding: Mr. H. T. Huddleston

3:30 - 4:00 p.m. Position paper regarding Fine Arts pre-professional requirements.
Dr. William Gower.

4:00 - 4:30 p.m. Discussion and recommendations.

6:00 p.m. Dr. McCain will be the host for a buffet supper in Dining Room B in the University Commons.

Presiding: Dr. Aubrey K. Lucas

7:30 - 8:15 p.m. Summary of Role and Scope Report.
Mr. James T. Sparkman.

8:15 - 9:00 p.m. Report of the Committee on the Uniform Numbering System. Discussion.
Mr. Robert B. Ellis.

Wednesday

Presiding: Dr. Joseph A. Greene, Jr.

9:00 - 9:30 a.m. Position paper regarding pre-professional requirements for Business Administration.
Dr. W. W. Littlejohn.

9:30 - 10:00 a.m. Discussion and Recommendations.

Presiding: Dr. Francis Rhodes

10:30 - 11:00 a.m. Position paper regarding pre-professional requirements for Teacher Education.
Dr. Carl L. McQuagge.

11:00 - 11:30 a.m. Discussion and Recommendations.

Presiding: Dr. William P. Lipscomb

1:00 - 1:30 p.m. Position paper regarding pre-professional requirements in Arts and Sciences.
Dr. Noel A. Childress

1:30 - 2:00 p.m. Discussion and Recommendations.

Presiding: Dr. James H. Mailey

2:30 - 4:00 p.m. Report of the committee on the harmonization of the recommendations for common core requirements. Discussion. Dr. J. J. Hayden.

4:00 p.m. Adjournment.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS
REVIEW OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE PREVIOUS WORKSHOP

Dr. Carl L. McQuagge

Your presence at this workshop is most encouraging. Last year the workshop was organized because of expressed concern for problems in higher education by many junior and senior college people. It was the belief of these people that open and frank discussion of the problems would be of interest to the schools and contribute to improved understanding and working relationships between all the institutions of higher learning. It appears that this belief was well founded, for the members at the close of last year's workshop pointed out the need of a second workshop this summer. This suggestion was given impetus in October by the Mississippi Junior-Senior College Conference at its annual meeting on the campus of the University of Mississippi. The conference adopted a resolution to the effect that consideration be given to implementing the recommendations made by the members of the workshop group meeting at the University of Southern Mississippi in June of 1965 and instructed the conference president to appoint a committee

for this purpose. The committee appointed by the president, Dr. E. R. Jobe, met in Jackson to discuss the matter. It was the judgement of this committee that the University of Southern Mississippi should be asked to devote the workshop this summer to the recommendation of the Junior-Senior College Conference.

The workshop leaders were happy to comply with the request of the committee, and this workshop has been structured to deal with the possibilities of implementing at least some of the recommendations made here a year ago.

To refresh our memory, I will restate the recommendations made by the workshop group last year. The recommendations by the Junior College were:

1. The workshop has been most productive on the critical problem of articulation. We appreciate the sponsorship by one of the universities of the annual Junior College Workshop. Next year's workshop may well be on an entirely internal problem of the junior colleges. We recommend that the regular Junior-Senior College meeting be continued every year. The workshops to continue, but the junior colleges to determine its nature year by year.

2. We recommend that each of the senior colleges develop a special orientation period for junior college transferees at the start of each academic year. The orientation should not only cover rules and regulations but also be a true counseling effort concentrated on the academic and social problems of a transferee.

3. We recommend that about every three or four years there be a departmental meeting of one or more faculty members from each junior and each senior college in each discipline. The purpose of these meetings being to develop a spirit of cooperation at the teaching level and an exploration of the teaching problems in the different institutions. We further recommend that one-half the meetings be held on a junior college campus.

4. We recommend that the Mississippi Junior College Association appoint a committee of junior college people to study the possibilities of a General Education core for optional use by the junior colleges.

5. We recommend that the Mississippi College Association appoint a committee to study the possibilities

of developing a commonalty in the content and designation of certain lower division courses.

6. We recommend that the junior colleges be given at least one year's advance notice before a change is made in the ACT cut-off score.
7. We recommend that when a senior college makes a change in the required courses the junior college commissioner be advised. The commissioner will then notify each of the junior colleges, both public and private.
8. We recommend that when a registrar or dean denies a transferee cerdit for a junior college course, that he advise the junior college as to what credit was denied and why. This will enable the junior college to prevent future problems.

The recommendations of the senior college group were:

1. Propose that central agency be considered for dissemination of institutional changes and that when changes are made it will be desirable that ample notice be given through the clearing agency.
2. We suggest that junior colleges consider holding closely to general education courses that are usually taught at the lower level division. This

presupposes that courses considered as an essential offering in a professional sequence should be offered by the institution granting the degree.

3. Study the feasibility of establishing subject-matter groups similar to the English Commission to study the course titles, content, and level of offering. This might well be done through the association of colleges.

4. It is the consensus of the senior college group that a similar conference of this nature should be held again next year.

It is noted that some of the recommendations are of concern to only one group. Too, time will not permit us to attempt the implementation of all the recommendations that affect the total group. In light of this, the workshop has been structured to consider the implementation of recommendation four made by the junior college group and recommendation two made by the senior college group. These recommendations are:

4. We recommend that the Mississippi Junior College Association appoint a committee of junior college people to study the possibilities of a General

Education core for optional use by the junior colleges.

2. We suggest that junior colleges consider holding closely to general education courses that are usually taught at the lower level division. This presupposes that courses considered as an essential offering in a professional sequence should be offered by the institution granting the degree.

An analysis of these two recommendations gives us our problems for this workshop. They are:

1. <u>The formation of a framework within which junior and senior colleges might develop core curricular or general education requirements acceptable for transfer between the institutions</u>.

2. The role of the junior colleges with respect to course offerings in the professional and pre-professional areas.

The balance of this presentation will deal with the first problem. The second problem will be dealt with in the position papers for the selected subject areas.

In presenting this problem, certain assumptions have been made. They are:

1. That there should be a common core or general

education requirement for all students. Such a requirement is found in most all college catalogs.

2. That a compact such as that proposed here should be worked out <u>jointly</u> by the junior and senior institutions.

3. That there is a basic interest on the part of college and university people in this state for developing such a compact and that the resolution of the Junior-Senior College Conference establishing an implementation committee for the workshop recommendations of last summer was an expression of this interest.

Acceptance of the assumptions brings us to the problem itself.

One only has to make a rather cursory examination of college and university catalogs to detect considerable variation from institution to institution in the core or general education requirements of the institution. This variation in requirements often results in penalizing the transfer student in time and money because he is required to meet the peculiar core requirement of the institution he transfers to. Are there any real reasons why the institutions of higher learning as a group cannot voluntarily develop a framework or set of guidelines within which each individual institution

can develop its own core requirements and these be acceptable to the other institutions for transfer students? If this kind of an agreement can be had--and I believe it can--it would be a most progressive step in higher education in this state. It is not claimed that such a step would be a final solution to all the problems of articulation between the colleges, but I do contend that these problems would be greatly reduced in number.

The development of such an agreement or compact between institutions does present many difficulties, but if the people concerned really believe that such a compact has value they will find ways of overcoming the difficulties. Where there is a <u>will</u> there is a <u>way</u>.

Above I made reference to the variation in core requirements as reflected in college catalogs. Hardly any two institutions have essentially the same requirements. The differences in requirements and the arbitrariness with which institutions enforce them at great cost to students tend to confirm the oft hurled criticism that institutions of higher learning are obsessed with regulation. Isocrates said on one occasion, 'Where there are a number of laws drawn up with great exactitude, it is proof that the city is badly administered.' Could it be that this is the case with institutions and their core requirements? Maybe we are

"obsessed with regulation." This charge gets further support because of the frequency of changes in core requirements made by many institutions, and these changes further compound a complex problem. In the case of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania vs. Rosanski the Superior Court Judge said: "To change the concept of the law every month makes a mockery of its majesty and a yo-yo of its practices." Certainly a framework within which each institution could develop a core acceptable to others would greatly reduce the amount of regulation and minimize the changes in the regulations in this area.

Next I want to raise with you the question as to the soundness of our action when we arbitrarily set specific general education requirements for large numbers of individuals? The most reputable authorities on general education tend to agree on the broad areas that should be included, but disagree vehemently on the specifics of general education and the level or degree of proficiency that should be required in each of the broad areas. This being the case, can we justify putting ourselves in the position of saying "This" will be accepted, and "That" will be rejected. One institution says to the students these courses are "Musts", he takes them, then transfers to another institution and it says to the student, no those "musts" at the sending insti-

tution are unacceptable, here is a new list of "musts" you will have to incorporate into your core requirements. This kind of thing becomes very puzzling to the student and causes him to ask whose right and whose wrong? Each may be wrong because neither has any evidence to indicate the real needs of the individual. The decision is made on the basis of a regulation that has no known relationship to the real needs of the individual. It just may be possible that general education may be acquired with quite a variation in course content anyway. Who knows? Or, course content may not play as vital a role as does methodology and the personality of the individual doing the teaching. Plato said,"The mind of a child is not a vessel to be filled, but a fire to be kindled." May I submit to you that a fire can be kindled with many different materials. This fact in itself suggests the need for flexibility in core requirements.

Next I would like to discuss the role of the institution with respect to the establishment of general education requirements. It seems to me that an institution has only three areas in which it may function. They are leadership, service, and regulation. The leadership function was initiated at the University of Mississippi in October, and is reflected in this workshop by the very fact that we are today giving thought to ways of developing and implementing a core compact.

Those of us here representing our respective institutions have to decide whether we will approach this problem on the basis of service to the students, or whether we are going to continue to hamper him with regulation. I will admit that regulation is the easy way out, but I am also convinced that the need and the challenge calls for a role of service. The question now becomes one of whether or not we will accept the challenge and have the ingenuity and the insights required to meet the need. I believe we will accept the challenge and that the need can be met.

Lastly, I want to point out that the idea of a core compact is not new. Florida has developed such a compact and other states are giving it consideration. The state of Washington has agreed that 35% of the four year requirement must be in the area of general education and leaves the specifics up to the student and the offerings of the institution. As I understand, a students core need not be the same as another students core in the same institution. Are there many valid arguments why each student's work should be the same in the area of general education?

Dr. Raymond Schultze in the workshop of last summer gave as the solution to this transfer dilema the following:

A. The cooperative establishment by the junior and

senior colleges in a state of overall guidelines for general education with freedom for each institution to develop its own program within the limits of these guidelines.

B. Senior colleges certify as having completed the general education requirement for a bachelor's degree, any student who has satisfied the general education requirements of a junior college.

This workshop can only develop the compact. The decision to abide by the compact is of course a decision to be made by the appropriate officials in each of the institutions. It is hoped that the development of a compact for consideration by the various institutions can be developed and that the representatives of each institution attending this workshop would assume responsibility for presenting the compact to the proper officials of your respective institution.

The possibilities of this assignment are great, and our success will be limited only by our own imagination, genius, and biases. However, a change that many of us are going to have to make is to stop being so sure we are right, and resenting anyone who questions what we are doing.

VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL PROGRAMS IN MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Mr. E. P. Sylvester

The first effort of any consequence of the Junior Colleges offering vocational training in the trades areas was in mid 1940, and this grew into a crash program in the years immediately following the termination of World War II. Programs in the fields of Trade and Industry, Business and Sales, and Agriculture offered on-the-job and institutional training primarily to veterans requiring rehabilitation. Private trade schools sprang up over night and were operated generally by inexperienced personnel who stressed in quite a few instances getting large enrollments and obtaining an approved budget thus resulting in large financial returns for the operators. These private schools offered an opportunity for veterans to draw subsistence and, thereby, with a minimum of training, help the general economy of the state. A few of the better programs operated in the junior colleges proved their worth and are still in operation. Two such programs come to mind, and these are the Herology Program at Jones County Junior College and the Office Machines Repair Program at Hinds Junior College.

The G. I. Programs were organized to do specific jobs. They were developed around vocational guidance, pre-academic training, and training for a specific objective with subsistence allowances. The programs terminated with job placement. I mention this to show that 25 or more years later we find ourselves today faced with another crash program in the M.D.T.A. which is also built around individual need, occupational guidance, pre-academic training when needed, training allowances while training, and job placement.

During the fifties, the junior colleges having weathered the G. I. crash programs, placed less emphasis on vocational training for the trades and industries. However, programs in business, secretarial science, and related areas were firmly established and continued to grow and today represent our largest training groups.

Faced in the late fifties and early sixties with a population explosion, shifting of population from rural areas to cities, scientific developments, the Mississippi Program of Balancing Agriculture With Industry, unemployment, under-educated groups, a large labor force, and the like, the Mississippi junior colleges were again faced with meeting the increasing need of providing vocational and technical training opportunities for the unskilled to provide adequate labor for the industries locating in the state. At that time, the

majority of the junior colleges were not equipped, nor financially able, to plunge into such diverse programs. However, with increased federal funds through the broadening of the Vocational Training Act, larger state appropriations, and increased local funds, the junior colleges began to provide and equip vocational and technical facilities, obtain qualified teaching and supervisory staffs, and greatly expand their overall programs. Their surge of growth has been so rapid it might well be stated that more progress in this area was made in the past three years than had been made in the past 20 years.

Let us see how Mississippi industry looks today. Information obtained from Mr. Bill Keith, Information Officer of the Agricultural and Industrial Board, indicates that:

> One year ago today, 145,000 people were employed in manufacturing; today, 160,000 are employed. During last year alone, 67 new industries were added and 88 others expanded providing an estimated 12,000 new jobs and representing a total capital investment of $268,000,000. The total investment in new industries for the calendar year will probably set a new record and may reach $300,000,000. The reason given for this industrial growth is that industry can see we now have a formal program for training skilled workers through our junior colleges which we did not have before.

Chapter 2 of the Report of the Task Force on 1 to 3 Year Education Programs of the Role and Scope Study, March 1, 1966, presents in a concise form the role of occupational and vocational education in Mississippi Junior Colleges. To attempt at this time to restate the needs and how they should be met would be a repetition. I suggest that if you have not had an opportunity to review this report, please do so, especially that part dealing with projected training needs.

The Vocational Division of the State Department of Education in its Projected Plan for Vocational and Technical Education in Mississippi for 1966-68 also presents a concise report on training needs in Mississippi and a proposed budget of operation. I suggest that a copy of this projected plan also be reviewed.

I would like at this time to present a progress report of the vocational and technical effort made by the junior colleges in the areas of new facilities, equipment, expanded programs, business and office education, vocational guidance and counseling, the curriculum laboratory, and the employment outlook for two year graduates in terminal programs.

Facilities

The following is an allocation of funds for Vocational and Technical facilities during 1965-66 in the Mississippi public junior colleges:

Junior College	Local Funds	State Funds	Vocational Educational Funds	Total
Holmes	$ 135,000.00	$ 135,000.00	$ 149,258.00	$ 419,258.00
Jones County	200,000.00	200,000.00	212,500.00	612,500.00
Gulf Coast	156,946.00	156,946.00	200,000.00	513,892.00
Meridian	206,321.50	206,321.50		412,643.00
Harris	160,000.00	160,000.00		320,000.00
Itawamba	200,000.00	200,000.00	200,000.00	600,000.00
Hinds	103,656.00	103,656.00	31,687.00	238,999.00
Northwest	200,000.00	200,000.00	255,860.00	655,860.00
Copiah-Lincoln	169,000.00	169,000.00		338,000.00
Pearl River	169,075.88	169,075.88	170,000.00	508,151.76
Miss. Delta			200,000.00	200,000.00
Totals	$1,699,999.38	$1,699,999.38	$1,419,305.00	$4,819,303.76

It is anticipated that additional funds for 1966-67 for projected construction costs for junior colleges from state and federal vocational education funds will be approximately $1,200,000. If an allocation of state funds under S. B. No. 1587 materializes, it is estimated an additional sum of $1,815,000 will be available to be matched by local funds on a 50-50 basis. If the above materializes, all the junior colleges will be in a favorable position from the standpoint of having adequate vocational and technical facilities.

Equipment for Vocational and Technical Programs

Equipment purchased for junior colleges from state and federal vocational education funds up to July 1, 1966, totaled $1,702,039.50.

It is contemplated that equipment for junior colleges to be purchased through vocational education funds during 1966-67 will be approximately $1,000,000.00

Under H. B. No. 1194, Regular Session, 1966, the sum of $1,200,000 was appropriated for the fiscal biennium 1966-67 for support, maintenance, and equipping of Vocational-Technical Departments in public Junior Colleges. This represents an increase of $200,000.00 over the last biennium.

Programs

The junior college staff of the State Department of Education conducted a survey of the vocational-technical courses being offered in the junior colleges during September, 1965. A similar survey was made in May, 1966 at the termination of the 1965-66 school year.

Of specific note is the recent growth in the business and office areas. The vocational and technical division joined hands with the junior colleges in business and office occupational training in September of 1965. Six programs in secretarial office practice and seven in data processing are

now in operation or will be in operation by September of 1966. These thirteen programs will be in eleven junior colleges.

These programs have received some $600,000 in equipment from the Vocational and Technical Division of the State Department of Education. Some of the junior colleges have matched the funds allocated to purchase secretarial office practice equipment.

During the next biennium, business and office evening class programs are expected to utilize a budget of about $100,000.

Vocational Guidance and Counseling

Margaret Mead, a world-famous anthropologist, once said, "We are now at the point where we must educate people in what nobody knew yesterday and prepare in our schools for what no one knows yet, but what some people must know tomorrow."

Those who are concerned with vocational aspects of guidance must be keenly aware of the economic and social changes now taking place. Those who will suffer the most from our inability to adjust to change will be the youngsters. For this reason, we must be guided by facts in developing the best possible vocational guidance programs.

A review of recent economic and social changes raises some vital questions for those concerned with vocational

guidance as well as for those who prepare persons for the world of work through our vocational education system.

We have had a massive shift in employment away from agriculture to other economic activities. Jobs in trade, government, service, finance, insurance, real estate, transportation, and public utilities have grown faster than occupations in other activities.

We have a mobile labor force. Many of the young persons trained in one community will move to another.

Technological developments constantly create change and call for the ability to adapt to new jobs and new skills. Since the average worker can expect to change jobs about six times during forty years of working life, he must be able to meet changing job requirements if he is to continue to be productive.

Each of these changes poses challenges to those who provide vocational guidance. The kinds of courses offered by vocational educators must be in tune with current reality and not the past.

Counselors concerned with vocational education must recognize that basic changes are taking place in vocational curriculums; the changes, however, will probably not take place as quickly as needed. This calls for imaginative and creative counseling which may, and should, in many cases,

break precedent with accepted means of counseling. Guidance for the young workers of tomorrow must not be built on a knowledge of yesterday's jobs.

A state supervisor of guidance has been employed by the Vocational and Technical Division of the Department of Education. Through his leadership a Vocational-Technical Guidance Guide is being prepared and should be available to every junior college guidance program by August. The Guide is to serve the needs of counselors as they try to help many of their students choose a successful future in a vocational or technical education course.

Indications are that ten junior colleges will have full time vocational-technical guidance counselors by the opening of the full term in 1966. These individuals are to work closely with high school counselors, high school and junior college students, and employers in an effort to fully utilize junior college vo-tech programs.

Curriculum Laboratory

The vocational-technical education curriculum laboratory is progressing in the development and revision of high school and junior college courses of study. Three professional staff members are working full time in the laboratory.

Courses in drafting design, electronics, and mechanical technology have been developed and are now in use. Some fifteen courses in the M.D.T.A. Programs have received hurried development and have been put to immediate use.

A priority list on curriculum needs has been devised for the lab staff, and they are making progress in several areas that are now under study.

Employment Outlook for Two Year Graduate - Very Good

The approximately 9,976 students enrolled in the vocational-technical programs of the Mississippi public junior colleges can be assured of a multiplicity of job opportunities if they successfully complete their courses of study. Recent reports obtained from the junior colleges indicate that there is no scarcity of openings. Salaries awaiting graduates average approximately $480.00 per month. A representative sampling of salaries being received by graduates in certain objectives are:

Refrigeration - range from $350 to $450 per month

Machine Shop - range from $1.79 to $2.90 per hour

F. M. and T. V. - range from $65 to $100 per week

Auto Mechanics - range from $60 to $150 per week plus commission

Auto Body & Fender Repair - range from $60 to $150 per week plus commission

Barbering - $75 weekly plus commission

Cosmetology - $40 per week plus commission which runs approximately $100 to $150 per week

Electronics Tech. - range from $80 to $90 per week

Drafting Tech. - range from $325 to $350 per month

Mechanics Tech. - approximately $400 per month

Civil Tech. - approximately $375 per month

Secretary & Business Education - range from $300 to $575 per month

Data Processing - range from $4,800 to $6,600 per year

The above is by no means inclusive. However, the progress made indicates the great forward thrust the junior colleges are making in meeting the training needs of Mississippi industry.

There are still many problems that must be solved such as:

- attracting and recruiting qualified students
- obtaining qualified staff personnel
- financing of programs and establishing per-pupil costs for each program
- flexibility of curriculums
- vocational-technical facilities (in certain junior colleges districts)
- coordination with Federal and state programs that lead to vocational-training such as "STAR", Adult Basic Education

under Title II-B of E.O.A., State Welfare Agency, and the like.

- follow up studies to determine the success of the efforts being made.

There still remains a great challenge for the junior colleges to constantly up-grade their programs and offer quality instruction in the areas of established needs. I believe they are well on the way of meeting this challenge.

REPORT ON THE ROLE AND SCOPE STUDY

Dr. James T. Sparkman

Chapter 367, Section 2, Mississippi Statutes of 1961, directed the Board of Trustees, Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning to make a study of the role and scope of the eight institutions for which it is responsible. Shortly thereafter, a study was begun that sought the involvement and cooperation of all the colleges and universities in Mississippi (public and private) rather than just the eight state controlled higher educational institutions. This decision was based on the sound reasoning that planning of the role and scope of one group of colleges would be invalid unless related to the long-range development foreseen for others operating in the state.

Dr. E. V. Hollis, former Director of College and University Administration of the U. S. Office of Education, was made General Consultant of the Study. The general design and organization was set up by Dr. Hollis with the following task forces: (a) Graduate and Professional Programs, (b) Four-Year Education Programs, (c) One to Three Year Education Programs, (d) Extension, Continuing and Off-Campus

Programs, and (e) State-wide Coordination of all programs. Later, due to the interest generated by the Federal Higher Educational Facilities Act of 1963, a Task Force on Facilities was established. Dr. Hollis' work with the study was terminated due to a long illness and death in early 1965. In the spring of 1965, Dr. S. V. Martorana, a personal friend and co-worker of Dr. Hollis, agreed to succeed him as General Consultant. The membership of the various Task Forces was as follows:

STEERING-COORDINATING COMMITTEE:

Dr. E. R. Jobe, Chairman
President J. D. Boyd
Dr. W. W. Clark
President D. W. Colvard
Dr. H. V. Cooper
President F. M. Fortenberry
President J. J. Hayden, Jr.
Mr. B. L. Hill
President R. A. McLemore
President Robert Mayo
President J. L. Reddix
Mr. Arno Vincent

TASK FORCE ON 1-3YEAR EDUCATION PROGRAMS:

Dr. L. O. Todd, Chairman
President W. B. Horton
President G. H. Johnston
Dr. Russell Levenway
President Robert Mayo
Dr. E. F. Mitchell
Mr. A. G. Shepherd, Jr.
Mr. E. P. Sylvester
Mr. Arno Vincent
President Walter Washington

Dr. J. L. Wattenbarger
Special Consultant

TASK FORCE ON 4-YEAR EDUCATION PROGRAMS:

Dr. T. K. Martin, Chairman
Dean John H. Allen
President W. L. Compere
Dr. Jack Freeman
Dean R. L. Johnson
Dean J. H. McLendon
Dr. Charles E. Noyes
Dr. John E. Phay
President J. H. White

Dr. Elvis Eckles
Special Consultant

TASK FORCE ON GRADUATE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION:

Dr. W. Alton Bryant, Chairman
Dean S. A. Brasfield
President J. M. Ewing
Dr. J. W. Lee
Dean J. C. McKee, Jr.
Dr. C. C. Mosley
Dean Ralph S. Owings
President J. B. Young

Dr. W. H. McFarlane
Special Consultant

TASK FORCE ON CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS:

Chancellor J. D. Williams, Chairman
Dr. John K. Bettersworth
President H. J. Cleland
President W. D. McCain
President R. D. McLendon
Dr. E. F. Yerby

Dr. Edward Duryea
Special Consultant

TASK FORCE ON VOLUNTARY COORDINATION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES:

Dr. Charles P. Hogarth, Chairman
Dr. W. L. Giles
President J. Ralph Noonkester
President Felix Sutphin

Dr. E. T. Dunlap
Special Consultant

TASK FORCE ON FACILITIES:

Dr. W. W. Clark, Chairman
Mr. Douglas Allen
Col. R. B. Johnson
Mr. R. S. Simpson
Mr. George M. Street
Mr. E. J. Yelverton

Dr. W. S. Fuller
Special Consultant

CONSULTANT AND RESOURCE PERSONS:

Dr. S. V. Martorana, General Consultant
Dr. James T. Sparkman, Administrative Officer
Dean W. C. Flewellen, Task Force Counselor
Dr. Randolph G. Kinabrew, Task Force Counselor

The overall direction of the study was vested in a Steering-Coordinating Committee of persons actively engaged in Mississippi Higher Education. The study itself was to be conducted in three phases.

Phase I saw all institutions working together as a statewide unit and five special task forces made up of personnel actively engaged in Mississippi higher education. In this phase, the present status and projected future needs of Mississippi for all types of post-high school education and related research and community services was assessed. Further, the roles of service in higher education to be performed by different types of higher educational institutions and programs were formulated. The special task forces, therefore, dealt with the special needs, and made recommendations.

Phase II of the Role and Scope Study was concerned with the type and scope of instruction, research, and public service of each participating institution. Staff members of each institution, organized by the administration and governing board for this purpose, prepared reports of the direction and degree of development envisioned for the next 15 to 20 years.

These reports were developed under "ground rules" established by the institution's own governing board and related bodies and with the help of guidelines distributed by the Steering-Coordinating Committee and its outside consultants.

As groundwork to this phase of the study a group of Engineering-Consultants was employed to spend a week studying the pattern of engineering and associated technical education in the State of Mississippi. This study was made of individual institutions during June, 1965, by the following Engineering Consultants:

Dr. Newman A. Hall, Executive Director, Commission on Engineering Education, Washington, D.C.

Dr. William H. McFarlane, Director of the Virginia Associated Research Center, Newport News, Virginia

Dr. John D. Ryder, Dean of the College of Engineering, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

Following the tour and recommendations of the Engineering Consultants, a Special Consultant was secured for each of the task forces. These consultants worked independently, with the task force, and with the General Consultant, as well as with the Steering-Coordinating Committee. These consultants were:

General and Special Consultants:

Dr. S. V. Martorana, General Consultant
Executive Dean, State University of New York
Former Assistant Commissioner for
Higher Education Planning
New York State Education Department
Albany, New York

Dr. E. T. Dunlap, Chancellor
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
(Special Consultant on Voluntary Coordination of
Public and Private Colleges and Universities)

Dr. Edward Duryea
Professor of Higher Education
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York
(Special Consultant on Continuing Education Programs)

Dr. Elvis Eckles
Director of Planning in Higher Education
State Department of Education
Albany, New York
(Special Consultant on 4-Year Education Programs)

Dr. W. S. Fuller
Director of Facilities Planning
Office of Education of the State of New York
Albany, New York
(Special Consultant on Facilities Committee)

Dr. William H. McFarlane, Director
Virginia Associated Research Center
Newport News, Virginia
(Special Consultant on Graduate-Professional
Education Programs)

Dr. James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Division of Community Junior Colleges
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida
(Special Consultant on 1-3 Year Education Programs)

In December 1965, Dr. S. V. Martorana, General Consultant of the Role and Scope Study, made An Interim Report on the Role and Scope of Higher Educational Institutions in Mississippi which included:

The Present Status of the Study:

1. All Task Force Reports are complete.
2. Institutional Reports (with a few exceptions) have been submitted.
3. The Consultants are now writing a consolidated report of their sections.
4. Dr. S. V. Martorana will write the final draft of the report and present to the Steering-Coordinating Committee in late summer.

Early Recommendations of the Task Forces: Since the final report will not be ready until late summer, it would be amiss for me to quote final recommendations. However, I would like to point out some of the major recommendations of the task forces and some of the changes that have already occurred, or are in the process of being implemented as a result of the Role and Scope Study.

Task Force on One to Three Year Programs

This task force made a number of recommendations which if implemented will have a profound effect on higher education in Mississippi. Some of these recommendations (by no means all) are:

1. The junior colleges should continue to be the institutions having the responsibility for preparation programs of less than baccalaureate level. The junior colleges should be comprehensive in nature; should provide preparation programs for high school graduates, or persons with equivalent educational background, and others who qualify for admission to the various specialized programs offered by these institutions.
2. No additional junior colleges should be authorized at the present time. There is need to consider additional centers in some parts of the state.
3. Each junior college should make a thorough study of its course offerings in the academic areas, and where it is possible to do so, low enrollment, high cost courses should be eliminated.
4. Junior and senior colleges and universities should reach a closer agreement on general education requirements. This must be done so that the junior colleges will not be forced into offering a proliferation of courses in order to meet the general education requirements of the senior colleges and universities.

5. Co-ordination and State Leadership - The committee makes the following recommendations:

   a. The public junior colleges should continue to operate under local administrative control exercised by the district board of trustees.

   b. Co-ordination and leadership of the public junior college should be strengthened and expanded at the state level.

   c. A Division of Junior Colleges should be established in the State Department of Education with a director and sufficient professional staff to handle such problems as research; curriculum; articulation and liaison with senior colleges, universities.

   d. The Director of the Division of Junior Colleges should serve as Executive Secretary of the Junior College Commission and the staff should serve as a professional staff for the Commission.

   e. Conflicts which exist between House Bill No. 428 and House Bill No. 112 of the 1964 Regular Session of the Mississippi Legislature, must be reconciled if the Junior College Commission is to assume fully the responsibilities which the law now assigns it.

Task Force on Four-Year Education Programs

After a rather extensive analysis of the programs and courses being offered by the four-year institutions of higher learning, the Task Force made some very important recommendations concerning these areas:

1. Neater and more discrete packages of major fields should be prepared.
2. Institutions should prune their current proliferations and nip all but very healthy and clearly justified new ones in the bud.
3. In reducing the number of major fields, institutions should move in the direction of fewer and more basic courses.
4. Boards of trustees should review or cause to be reviewed low production major fields with a view toward reducing wasteful duplication within institutions. The Board of Trustees of Institutions of Higher Learning should review all low production areas duplicated in multiple institutions under its control with a view toward deleting offerings in some institutions and toward fixing the role and scope of institutions at the baccalaureate level.

In order to implement the above recommendations, the Task Force made the following recommendations:

"The Curriculum Council." The Love Report of 1961, out of which grew this Role and Scope Study, recommended that consideration be given by the Board of Trustees of Institutions of Higher Learning to adding a member to its staff for such responsibilities as, among other things, "assisting the institutions in developing their programs."

The committee sees this member in a coordinating role and recommends that each program change of the magnitude of the initiation of a new major or the creation of a new department (including the division of an existing department into two new ones) be reviewed by a council in the appropriate area under his chairmanship before being taken to the Presidents' Council or to the Board.

The Committee further recommends that the coordinator proceed systematically to assemble appropriate councils to review all programs offered under the Board of Trustees in which there is apparent unnecessary duplication and to report recommendations of the several councils to the Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees.

Membership on a council, the committee feels, might well consist of three persons representing the discipline under review from each institution offering or proposing to offer the program under review. Members should be above the rank of instructor and below the rank

of dean. (Private schools should be represented on a voluntary, invitational basis.)

The council should be free to invite interested persons, deans or heads of institutions, to present proposed new programs or to appear in behalf of others under review.

Voting should be on an individual basis, one vote for each member of a council.

Calls for council meetings should channel through the Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees to the heads of the institutions.

Results of the deliberations in terms of specific recommendations, which would not be considered binding, would be channeled through the Executive Secretary to all the members of the Presidents' Council and finally come before the Board.

The committee records these thoughts with no firm conviction that they are the answers but in hope that they lead in the direction of an answer.

Task Force on Graduate-Professional Education Programs

The Task Force on Graduate-Professional Education included in its recommendations basically the same approach to eliminating and preventing wasteful duplication as broached by the Task Force on Four-Year Education Programs. In addition to this recommendation, the Task Force recommended

the following:

Finance:

1. That in appropriating funds for higher education, the State Legislature provide adequate support for the educational programs of the institutions of higher learning at all levels, as determined by the allocation formulas of the Board of Trustees.
2. That allocation formulas specifically oriented to costs of graduate programs and research be revised upward to more realistic levels: such factors include average teaching salaries, allocations for departmental and organized research, graduate assistantships and fellowships.
3. That a special salary fund be set aside for institutions with strong graduate programs to attract outstanding research faculty; the range for such salaries is currently estimated at $12,000 to $30,000.
4. That a special research fund be allocated to the Board of Trustees to encourage and support research activities by qualified faculty members of institutions presently without doctoral programs or highly developed research capabilities. (In this regard, one million dollars has been made available during this biennium.)

5. That in making capital appropriations to institutions of higher learning, particular consideration be given to needs for specialized laboratories, equipment and library resources required to strengthen graduate and research activities.

Future Programs:

1. That proposed programs in graduate and professional fields be evaluated in terms of criteria established by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and the Council of Graduate Schools.
2. That a Graduate Study and Research Council be established to review new proposals for graduate and professional programs; Council membership should include representatives from institutions of higher learning having established or authorized graduate programs, and from the executive staff of the Board of Trustees; the Council should be directly responsible to the Board of Trustees, acting as advisor to the Board on matters pertaining to the development of graduate programs.
3. That the Council undertake a special study of low-enrollment-high-cost programs presently offered or anticipated, and that the Board of Trustees encourage the elimination of duplication in such programs.

Coordination:

1. That established graduate institutions, in cooperation with the Board of Trustees, vigorously promote the development of appropriate cooperative programs at the Jackson Centers and the Gulf Coast Research Laboratory.
2. That established graduate institutions seek opportunities to develop joint graduate programs in areas of mutual strength; and that such institutions render appropriate assistance to institutions that are authorized to begin new graduate activities, particularly in professional education and teacher training.
3. That the Board of Trustees take immediate steps to strengthen its long-range planning and coordinating function; such steps should include continuing evaluation of statewide needs, open discussions of institutional planning, exchange of information among institutions on proposed new developments, and negotiations and mutual agreements between institutions on new programs.
4. That the Board of Trustees be provided with sufficient funds to employ qualified consultants to undertake special studies of needs and resources, when necessary for the development of long-range plans and priorities; studies of this sort might well begin with needs and proposed programs in medical and paramedical fields,

and in social work; evaluation of library and computer facilities, with proposals for inter-connected services, or other areas that will likely need serious attention in the immediate future.

Task Force on Voluntary Coordination

The Task Force on Voluntary Coordination made one recommendation which has already been partially implemented. This recommendation concerns state agencies administering federal funds to higher education:

> We recommend that the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning be asked to serve, with the assistance of a representative Advisory Committee, as the administrative agency for administering such funds. We recommend that this Advisory Committee consist of approximately fifteen heads of all junior, senior, public and private colleges and universities in the State. These are to be chosen by the heads of the institutions last September. We recommend that these two recommendations be presented to the Governor of the State of Mississippi for his consideration and action.

Another recommendation of the Task Force was:

We recommend the formation of a voluntary coordinating council which should be called the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in Mississippi. The objectives of this Council shall be:

1. To provide for the cooperative planning of the continuing development of all institutions of higher education in the State of Mississippi.
2. To consider anything received from any source that in the opinion of the Council members relates to the effectiveness and improvement of higher education in the State of Mississippi, with special emphasis being given to those items that show promise toward better cooperation and coordination of higher education institutions in meeting the higher education needs of Mississippi.
3. To take a position on any such items that are considered to be of importance, and
4. To relate its positions in writing to the heads and the chairmen of controlling boards of all institutions of higher education in the State of Mississippi, and on items as deemed

appropriate to state its position to all citizens of the State through the press and/or radio and television.

Task Force on Continuing Education

1. After laboring long and diligently with this rather thorny problem, the Task Force recommended the establishing of a cooperative statewide program for continuing education.
2. Present plans for implementation in Jackson Center.

Task Force on Facilities

This will be done from the institutional reports.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM COURSE NUMBERING

Mr. Robert B. Ellis

The committee agreed at the beginning of its session that it had two questions to answer. First, whether or not a study of a uniform system of course numbers is feasible; and, second, if such a study is feasible, just what steps are necessary to get it underway.

Dean Ogletree provided the committee with copies of information concerning the uniform course numbering system used by the Texas Commission on Higher Education and a copy of the Bulletin of Hill Junior College which illustrates how the uniform system is presented in an institution's publication. The advantage of this arrangement, it was agreed, is that an institution can retain its present numbering system for its local purposes and also have its courses classified in a uniform numbering system for statewide purposes.

Mr. Posey gave members of the committee copies of the Mississippi State University Guide to Revised Course Numbers and described the extensive study made on his campus which led to the development of a new course numbering system.

After discussing the materials submitted, the committee decided that a study for the development of a uniform numbering system is feasible and should be made. The following recommendations were made:

1. That tentatively a two-year study be planned with an approximate annual budget as follows:

Director	$18,000
Secretary	5,400
Equipment	1,500
Supplies and Expense	2,000
Travel	1,500
Committee Expense	2,400
Total	$30,800

*First year only

2. That the committee submit a study proposal first to the Esso Education Foundation, and if that is not successful, then to the U. S. Office of Education to underwrite the cost of conducting the study.

3. That the President of the Mississippi College Association be requested to ask two representatives from Negro institutions in the State to serve with the present committee (one preferably from Jackson State College).

4. That each member of the present committee develop a study proposal before the first of August.

5. That the committee meet early in August in Jackson to adopt a proposal and to develop a list of prospective study directors.

6. That a progress report be made at the October Junior-Senior College Conference.

PRE-PROFESSIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Dr. W. W. Littlejohn

The following summary has been prepared from an analysis of offerings of The American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business for 1964.

	Mississippi State University	Mean	Median	Number Requiring					
				None	1-3 Sem. Hrs.	4-6 Sem. Hrs.	7-9 Sem. Hrs.	10-12 Sem. Hrs.	13 or more
Communications:	9	7.4	6						
Oral and Written (Composition and/or speech)				0	6	36	28	13	0
English or literature				0	1	2	0	0	0
Mathematics:	6	5.3	6						
Algebra				0	9	4	0	0	0
Business math				0	2	0	0	0	0
Algebra and business math				0	0	1	0	0	0
Algebra and analytic geometry				0	0	2	0	0	0
Algebra and trigonometry				0	2	2	0	0	0
Business math and finite math				0	2	2	0	0	0
Calculus				0	2	5	0	0	0
Finite mathematics				0	2	6	0	0	0
Finite math and calculus				0	0	10	6	1	0
Finite mathematics or calculus				0	2	2	0	0	0
Not specified				6	4	13	1	0	0
TOTAL				6	25	47	7	1	0
Natural Science	6	5.1	6	27	3	32	17	7	0
Social Science	12	15.5	16	0	0	7	6	9	63
Humanities	6	10.6	9	8	6	20	20	13	16

AACSB requires 40% of total semester hours to be in general education.
AACSB requires 40% of total semester hours to be in business and economics

The normal program for the first two years is made up of mainly pre-professional or general education courses. Most programs call for at least one year of accounting and possibly one year of economics in the first two years. All other business or professional courses are generally given in the last two years. A small number of member schools offer as many as six additional semester hours of business courses in the first two years.

Business schools as a rule maintain about the same composition of general education or pre-professional requirements during the first two years as liberal arts schools. Many students transfer to business for their junior and senior years.

BUSINESS REQUIREMENTS lower case

	Mississippi State University	Mean	Median	Number Requiring					
				None	2-4 Sem. Hrs.	5-7 Sem. Hrs.	8-10 Sem. Hrs.	11-13 Sem. Hrs.	13 or more
Business Core:									
Accounting	9	7.0	6.0	0	3	54	26	3	0
Marketing	3	3.3	3.0	0	79	7	0	0	0
Finance	3	3.3	3.0	1	78	7	0	0	0
Statistics	6	4.1	3.0	0	62	24	0	0	0
Management	3	6.2	6.0	8	32	29	20	2	3
Economics	9	8.1	7.5	0	2	41	25	12	6
Business Law	6	4.4	3.0	0	48	38	0	0	0
Money & Banking	3			38	48	0	0	0	0
Business Policy	0			40	46	0	0	0	0
Communications	3			42	44	0	0	0	0

FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION lower case

There has been very little change in the fields of specialization during the past decade--average number of fields decreased from 8.7 to 8.5 per school.

The older schools appear to be reducing the fields of specialization: whereas, the newer schools are increasing the number of fields in which one can specialize.

The eight most common fields of specialization with 18 to 21 semester hours in each are:

Field	Number of Schools
Accounting	85
Marketing	82
Finance	78
Industrial relations	54
Office management/secretarial	52
General business	44
Insurance	42
Administration, policy, and management	41

The courses given and the number of fields in which courses are offered have decreased over the past decade. Nine areas of study are present in most all schools: three areas--acounting, marketing, and finance--with several courses; and six areas--management, law, industrial relations, insurance production, and personnel--with an average of three courses. As economics is not in all business schools, it is considered as a special case.

SOURCE: Data for this summary obtained from The American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, 1916-1966.

PRE-PROFESSIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Dr. Carl L. McQuagge

The issue of who should prepare teachers and what should constitute the preparation is an old one. For this reason I am certain many of you will not agree with some of the things I have to say on this subject, and you probably shouldn't, but I hope they will serve as the basis for discussion and that out of the discussion will come better understanding of the problem, of the role of junior colleges and senior colleges, and that we may even achieve some areas of agreement.

In my haste to develop a position paper on professional education at the pre-service level, certain basic assumptions have been made. The assumptions are predicated upon the report of last year's workshop, practices as they are found with regard to preparing teachers, and a considerable body of literature. They are:

1. That teaching is a profession and the preparation of teachers should be done by schools that are recognized and accredited for this purpose.
2. That the institution preparing a professional

person must be responsible for the quality of the preparation.

3. That the preparing institution has to be granted the right to determine the content of the preparation program subject to state law and accrediting regulations.

4. That at its best the pre-service preparation of a teacher is little more than permitting a medical student to practice medicine with a pre-medical education, or a law student to practice law with pre-law education.

In light of the basic assumptions, teacher education becomes the responsibility of a senior institution operating within the framework of state law and teacher education accrediting regulations for approving programs so as to give individuals the best preparation possible for teaching. To achieve this objective requires that the basic preparation of teachers occurs in schools with a strong academic program as well as a strong professional program in a definitely professional atmosphere.

Let us examine a trend in pre-service teacher education and then explore some of the problems.

Probably the most pronounced trend on the American

scene today in teacher education is that of approving programs within the institution and the completion of an approved program by an individual leading automatically to certification. This kind of emphasis is found in many states, schools of education, and supported by the NCATE. Accompanying this trend is a renewed emphasis on the trainee being well grounded in general education, having a strong area of specialization if they are to teach in high school, and being allowed to embark upon a teacher education program only after they have been thoroughly screened.

The trend pointed out and the accompanying emphases have inherent in them a number of problems that affect or influence what each institution should do in the area of teacher education. An approved teacher education program is for a given institution; it is professional in nature; and the problem arises as to how much if any of such a program should an institution accept or delegate to an institution not operating an approved program. Some questions associated with this are: How does the problem of screening for admission to teacher education affect the role of junior colleges? What is the outlook of maintaining NCATE approved programs without screening? Can institutions not operating teacher education programs maintain qualified and effective personnel for professional courses? What courses constituting

a part of the total preparation of teachers can be effectively taken in junior colleges? At what point in the four year program of a student should the professional preparation of teaching begin? These questions are closely interrelated and the answer to any one influences decisions with respect to the others. The answers are also influenced by the fact that the senior colleges had enrolled in 1964-65, 12,809 whites and 3,384 negroes in the first and second year for a total of 16,193 students. The junior colleges had enrolled 10,500 whites, and 1,950 negroes for a total of 12,450 the same year. The junior college figures do not include vocational-technical enrollments. Enrollment data for the past few years indicates that junior college enrollemnts have been graudally gaining on freshman and sophomore enrollments in senior colleges and the prediction is that within the next few years may be equal to the enrollments in the senior colleges for the first two years.

Across the country there is no hard and fixed pattern as to the year teacher education programs begin the professional preparation. One can find a few programs that will begin the first year the student is in college, some will begin with the second year, but many begin with the third year of college work. The real facts seem to be that re-

gardless of the year an institution begins professional preparation for teacher education the program is predominantly achieved in the third and fourth years of college work. The facts that in the not too distant future fifty per cent (50%) of the third and fourth year students in the senior institutions could be transfers of the trend toward screening for admission to teacher education programs; and that the institution must assume responsibility for the quality of the professional program. It seems only logical in our situation that courses used in the professional part of the preparation of teachers be at the level of the third and fourth years. Acceptance of this position does not mean there is not a contribution for the junior colleges to make. The best foundation and one of the most needed elements for admitting individuals to a teacher education program is a <u>strong program</u> in <u>general education</u>. This preparation in general education is what should constitute the work for pre-teacher education. It is an area entirely within the sphere of the junior colleges and something that is done well can be a most excellent and worthwhile contribution to teacher education. The junior college student could also pursue one or more subject matter areas to some depth as all students are required to ultimately develop a major area of concentration. The general education

program, the pursuit of one or more subject areas to some depth, and the provision of electives can accomodate the students' needs during the first two years. This kind of a contribution fits in perfectly with the general education compact idea. The general education requirements for admission to teacher education may need to be greater than the core for each institution, consequently, such a background should be evolved through junior and senior colleges working together to achieve some agreement in this area.

To achieve the above working relationships among the junior and senior colleges will require a rather clear delineation on the part of the senior colleges of what will constitute the general education requirements basic to teacher education. The professional courses are already identified as a result of the development of certification requirements. The certification requirements also establish certain minimum requirements in general education, but the question arises as to whether these requirements are sufficient for individuals preparing to teach. Many think they are, many think they are not. To illustrate, the certification requirement calls for only 6 semester or 8 quarter hours in social studies with the student having the option of electing what these courses will be. Obviously, if a

person is to be well grounded in social studies and be equipped to live in the complex society of today's world he needs to know the basic principles of American government, sociology, economics, geography, and general psychology. Some would even extend this list. I for one would like for these subject areas to constitute the minimum requirement in social studies. Such a requirement would increase the course offerings at the first two year level of any institution. If this kind of program should be undertaken the junior colleges would experience a net gain even though they dropped all course offerings in professional education.

In the area of professional education many of the junior colleges have already reduced the course offerings to a minimum. Some may have already dropped all such offerings, I do not have the full information on this point. In the past the difficulty has been with such courses as educational methods, human growth and development, and introduction to education. To be most effective, methods courses need to be tied to observation and student teaching. Without some means of providing some insights the material in methods courses largely becomes verbalism and meaningless. An institution teaching such courses should be able to provide these experiences.

A very important element in a teacher education program is understanding the behavior of the children the trainee will be teaching. Work in this area should be as extensive as possible. Elementary trainees need to concentrate on child psychology, and secondary teachers need to concentrate on adolescent psychology. Courses titled "Human Growth and Development" usually attempt to cover child and adolescent behavior with the result that the trainee taking such a course is not as well grounded in this area as he could be and needs to be.

"Introduction to Education" is an orientation course not only to teaching, but also to the specific program of the institution. We here at the University of Southern Mississippi also plan to begin operating the course in September as a means of screening students for admission to teacher education. Large numbers of students have been taking this course in junior colleges which means a separate screnning program will have to be operated for these people. When this course is taken at an institution other than the one where the student is taking his teacher education program the benefits listed are lost.

In summary it appears that the professional part of teacher education should be reserved for the senior institu-

tions and that the junior and senior colleges should cooperate on giving prospective teachers a strong background in general education with a possible start on a subject-matter major.

PRE-PROFESSIONAL REQUIREMENTS IN ARTS AND SCIENCES

Dr. Noel A. Childress

In discussing the course requirements to be met by students entering the College of Liberal Arts and proposing to do subsequent professional work we will confine ourselves to the situation as it exists at the University of Mississippi since this is the situation with which I am most familiar. This means that we will exclude students proposing to go into Business and Government, Education, Engineering, and Pharmacy. With us these students register directly in the respective professional schools. They take all their liberal arts courses in departments in the College of Liberal Arts but the courses taken are closely prescribed by their respective professional schools. This leaves the following professions to be considered: medicine, dentistry, medical technology, nursing, and law.

Pre-law students present no particular curriculum problem since the School of Law pointedly and explicitly does not recommend any course of study. It asks merely for a bachelor's degree from an acceptable four-year college with a "C" average earned on all work attempted. As a

matter of personal opinion we generally remind pre-law students that a lawyer must read voluminous records and must be able to do so rapidly and accurately. A lawyer must also be able to write clearly and accurately. We, therefore, direct the attention of a pre-law student to English as a possible major or minor. Beyond this we rarely go although as a matter of fact most law students display a keen interest in history and political science.

Pre-nursing students again present no problem since the Nursing School calls for only one year of academic subjects and prefers that they be taken at the Nursing School. These subjects are inorganic chemistry, eight semester hours; general biology or zoology, six semester hours; English, six semester hours; history, six semester hours; sociology, six semester hours. This program can be easily completed in one academic year.

This leaves for our consideration students proposing to go into medicine, dentistry, and medical technology. At this point the beginning student is faced with two problems. He is keenly aware of one of these and his adviser should be aware of the other. The student's problem is that of satisfying the entrance requirements of his chosen professional school. The program should obviously be de-

signed to qualify the student for the desired school. The adviser's problem arises from the statistical fact that only about half of those students who begin such pre-professional training will ever carry it to completion. It is a problem for the adviser, therefore, to develop a program which will permit the student to achieve his professional objective and at the same time to minimize his losses should his objective change.

If we look at the minimum admission requirements for Schools of Medicine and Schools of Dentistry, we find that each require a full year of inorganic chemistry and a full year of organic chemistry (sixteen semester hours), a full year of biology (eight semester hours), a full year of mathematics (six semester hours), a full year of physics (eight semester hours), and a full year of English (six semester hours. In addition, medical schools require eight hours of advanced science and thirty-eight additional hours of approved electives. Dental schools commonly require only ten additional hours of electives. Schools of medical technology require as a minimum for admission the same two full years of chemistry (sixteen semester hours), two years of biology (sixteen semester hours), and one semester of mathematics (three semester hours). No other courses are specifically required for medical technology but a full

year course in physics is strongly recommended. These requirements are displayed in Table 1.

Pre-medical and pre-dentistry students should, therefore, follow the following curriculum during their freshmam and sophomore years.

Freshman year		Sophomore year	
Course	Semester hours	Course	Semester hours
Chemistry (Inorganic)	8	Chemistry (Organic)	8
Biology	8	Physics	8
Mathematics	6	English	6
English	6	Social Science elective	6
Social Science elective	6	Foreign Language (recommended)	6
Total	34	Total	34

If he wishes to obtain a Bachelor of Science degree also, he should take:

Junior year

Course	Semester hours
Chemistry (Analytical and Physical)	8
Foreign Language	6
Biology (recommended)	8
Approved electives to total	104

Upon the completion of these 104 semester hours a student is eligible to receive a Bachelor of Science degree upon the completion of the first year in medical school or upon completion of the four-year program in an approved dental school.

A student desiring a Bachelor of Science degree in

medical technology can follow precisely the same curriculum in his freshman and sophomore years. In his junior year he is required to complete twelve additional hours of advanced biology but only four additional hours of chemistry (analytical). Upon completion, again, of 104 semester hours of work and graduation from an approved school for clinical laboratory technicians, the Bachelor of Science degree in medical technology will be awarded.

These curricula satisfy the minimum entrance requirements of these professional schools and will earn a Bachelor of Science degree for the student who completes the particular professional program. They satisfy the needs of the student with respect to his professional education.

The next question is, "How do they satisfy the problem of the counselor who has to advise this student who may well change his objective before completing the program." To answer this problem with respect to the University we must look at the degree requirements at the University of Mississippi. All students entering the College of Liberal Arts must take at least one course in each of the following four groups and continue to do so each succeeding semester until the following requirements are completed:

Course	Semester hours
English	12
Foreign Language	6 to 18
Two natural sciences, one full year course in each of at least 6 semester hours	12
Two social sciences, 6 semester hours	12
Physical Education activity or ROTC	4 to 12

In addition each student must complete one major of from twenty-four to thirty semester hours, one related minor of eighteen semester hours, and one nonrelated minor of eighteen semester hours. On the average from twenty-four to twenty-seven semester hours of free electives will be available to bring the total to the 130 semester hours required for graduation.

On comparing these general liberal arts requirements with the pre-professional programs outlined above a pre-medical or pre-dental student finds himself even at the end of his third year in this situation. He will have completed all the lower division requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree except, perhaps, for one year of foreign language. He can continue his professional program and use his first year of medical school, his four years of dental school, or his complete medical technology training for the remaining twenty-six semester hours required for his Bachelor of Science degree. On the other hand, he can without undue difficulty

abandon his professional program and complete an academic major and related minor in biology and chemistry and a non-related minor in any other of several areas. All this can be done without undue difficulty in one academic year.

The only real difficulties that arise in connection with these pre-professional programs are that medicine requires an extended sequence of chemistry courses and medical technology requires an extended sequence of biology courses. These students, therefore, must be advised to begin their chemistry and biology promptly and to pursue them systematically. They must, also, for the sake of their subsequent courses, take mathematics as promptly as possible.

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

	Chemistry Sem. Hrs.	Biology Sem. Hrs.	Mathematics Sem. Hrs.	Physics Sem. Hrs.	English Sem. Hrs.	Advanced Science Sem. Hrs.	Approved Electives Sem. Hrs.	Additional Requirements for Bachelor of Science degree at University of Mississippi
Medicine	16	8	6	8	6	8	38	12 hours foreign language + 6 hours English + approved electives to total 104 semester hours
Dentistry U.of Tenn. Catalog	16	8	6	8	12	-	10	12 hours foreign language + 6 hours English + approved electives to total 104 semester hours
Medical Technology	16	16	3	Strongly Recommended	-	-	-	12 hours foreign language +12 hours English + approved electives to total 104 semester hours
Nursing	8	6	-	-	6	--	6 History 6 Sociology	Note that four complete years of residence are required to complete the nursing program, regardless of the credits transferred in.
Law	A Completed Bachelor's Degree							

A REPORT ON THE MEETING OF THE JOINT JUNIOR-SENIOR COLLEGE COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON HARMONIZING THE REPORTS OF THE TWO COMMITTEES ON GENERAL EDUCATION OR CORE PROGRAMS

The committee met at 2:30 p.m. with President J. J. Hayden, Jr., serving as Chairman. Representatives from the senior colleges were Dr. Merton Zahrt of the University of Southern Mississippi, Dr. Sylvester A. Moorhead of the University of Mississippi, Dr. John H. Christmas of Millsaps College, Dr. Mack G. McRaney of Delta State College, and Dr. Noel A. Childress of the University of Mississippi. Junior college representatives were Mr. Enoch Seal of Pearl River, Mr. J. P. McCormick of Senatobia, Mr. Ernest W. Wilson of Holmes, Mr. Brad Tucker of East Central, and Mr. R. L. Woods of Itawamba, and Dr. Floyd Elkins of Hinds Junior College.

Announcement of the task facing the group was discussed, and it was necessary for the representatives of the senior colleges to reach a common agreement upon the recommendations made by their group. After this was accomplished, the group then clarified some misunderstandings of termonology that were giving difficulty in communicating the precise intensions of certain provisions

that had been prepared by the two groups. For example, the junior college proposal calls for a maximum of thirty-six semester hours of core work being accepted by a senior institution for each junior college transfer student. This, however, does not mean that there is a maximum amount of work that the institution will accept or would require the student to earn. Rather, the core subjects accepted in the thirty-six semester hour agreement must be counted toward the student's graduation.

Another problem discussed was that liberal arts majors at the University of Mississippi are required to take six semester hours in the same social studies course so that they cannot accumulate three semester hours in one and three in another. The problem herein for many junior colleges is that they only offer six semester hours in social studies in history courses. In most of the other social studies course areas they offer only three semester hours. To meet the University of Mississippi requirement would require many of the junior colleges to broaden their curriculums, and one of the chief purposes of establishing the core curriculum general education program is to help the junior college hold its course offering to a minimum. It was suggested that the University of Mississippi give further study to the problem through an examination of

their liberal arts program with the view toward allowing credit for the courses given in the general education program at the junior college. Then if an additional requirement was deemed necessary, require the student to enroll in another three semester hour course in one of the social studies areas other than history in which he had gained credit.

Another problem involved the Millsaps College requirement of six semester hours in English literature whereas most of the other senior institutions accept six semester hours which includes other literature courses offered on the lower division level.

Still another problem involved Delta State's requiring eight semester hours in a laboratory science. It was further recognized that the problems involving students transfering to engineering schools would be complicated and difficult to solve.

It was hoped that the solutions to these problems could be arrived at through further study. It was stressed by all members of the group that the junior college must do a good job in counseling and guidance to make certain that the junior college student take the correct courses in their general education requirements if the universities are to be able to cooperate in such a program.

As an example, the junior college must use good judgment in requiring a pre-med major to earn his science credit in a laboratory course and that a college pre-engineering student enroll in a math course included in the core program which meets the requirement of the pre-engineering school at the university. Further, that a student planning to major in music enroll in junior college general education courses that are transferrable.

After further discussion, the committee unanimously agreed upon the following statements and course requirements:

It is recommended by this workshop that institutions of higher learning in the State of Mississippi study the proposed general education requirements listed on the next page. Each institution is requested to report its views concerning their adoption to the Junior-Senior College Conference to be held in Biloxi in October, 1966.

Report of the Joint Committee - Senior College and Junior College - on "Core Curriculum"

It is recommended by this Workshop that institutions of higher learning in the State of Mississippi study the proposed general education requirements listed below. Each institution is requested to report its views concerning their adoption to the Junior-Senior College Conference to be held in Biloxi in October, 1966.

These 36 hours would be applied toward a degree; that is, without causing the specified number of hours required for graduation to be increased:

English Composition		6 Semester hours
Literature		6 Semester hours
Social Science (6 hours must be in history)		12 Semester hours
Science		6 Semester hours
Mathematics	3 - 6	6 Semester hours
Fine Arts	0 - 3	
		36 Semester hours